

DRAFT
NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND
REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS AND
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM
MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 5, 2012

These minutes summarize discussions with the remedial project managers (RPM) and the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) for the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NAVSTA TI). The meeting began at 10:00 a.m. on September 5, 2012, at the office of Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tetra Tech) in Oakland, California. The agenda and sign-in sheet are included as Attachment 1.

The following participants attended the meeting:

Izzat Amadea, Department of the Navy
Resident Officer in Charge of Construction
(ROICC), by telephone

Kate Austin, Treasure Island Development
Authority (TIDA), by telephone

Lora Battaglia, Navy, by telephone

Jessica Beck, Tetra Tech

George Bibbins, San Francisco Public
Utilities Commission (SF PUC)

Bob Burns, NGTS Inc. (consultant to AMEC
and TIDA), by telephone

Bill Carson, Terraphase Engineering
(consultant to Treasure Island Community
Developers [TICD])

Dave Clark, Navy

Pete Coutts, Shaw Environmental &
Infrastructure Group (Shaw)

Zachary Edwards, Navy Radiological
Affairs Support Office (RASO), by
telephone

Jerry Hensley, California Department of
Public Health Radiological Health Branch
(CDPH RHB), by telephone

Brian Holmgren, Shaw

Danielle Janda, Navy, by telephone

Quinn Johnson, Tetra Tech

Carolyn Jones, SF PUC

Tracy Jue, CDPH Environmental
Management Branch (EMB), by telephone

Anthony Konzen, Navy, by telephone

Radhika Majhail, California Department of
Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), by
telephone

Marcie Rash, Tetra Tech, by telephone

Tony Searls, Shaw, by telephone

Mark Somerville, Shaw, by telephone

David Stensby, U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency (EPA), by telephone

James Sullivan, Navy

Remedios (Medi) Sunga, DTSC

Denise Tsuji, DTSC

Tommie Jean Valmassy, Tetra Tech

Scott Warner, AMEC (consultant to TIDA)

Matt Wright, CDPH EMB, by telephone

Myriam Zech, Regional Water Quality
Control Board (Water Board)

I. Introductions, Meeting Guidelines, and Agenda Review

Jessica Beck (Tetra Tech) began the meeting with introductions and asked if any other items were to be added to the agenda (see Attachment 1). No new items were added to the agenda.

II. Approval of BCT Meeting Minutes

James Sullivan (Navy) said the draft July and August 2012 meeting minutes were distributed to the BCT for review. The January through June 2012 meeting minutes are outstanding to the BCT.

III. Navy and Organizational Updates

Navy Organizational Updates

Mr. Sullivan said there were no Navy organizational updates.

TIDA Organizational Updates

Scott Warner (AMEC) said Kate Austin (TIDA) will be replacing Kelly Pretzer (TIDA).

Other BCT Organizational Updates

No organizational updates were provided by the BCT.

Navy Funding

Dave Clark (Navy) reviewed the Navy's funding priority list for fiscal year 2012 (see Attachment 2), which does not include projects that have already been contracted. He said the remaining three project priorities for fiscal year 2012 will be contracted by the end of September. These include: Site 27 Remedial Action (RA); Yerba Buena Island (YBI) lead-based paint (LBP) inspections; and supplemental radiological scanning and investigation for Site 12, Building 3, Site 32, Site 6 and pipelines.

He said the Site 12, Building 3, Site 32, Site 6 and pipeline supplemental radiological scanning and removal actions item encompasses various radiological projects on NAVSTA TI. The Site 12 scanning will include roadways and areas not previously scanned but will not include the solid waste disposal areas (SWDA). The optical repair shop formerly located on the roof of Building 3 and its associated sanitary sewer lines will be addressed under the same contract. The second location of the USS *Pandemonium*, at Site 32, and the entrances and exits of the Site 6 radiologically controlled area will be included. The contract will be modified in fiscal year 2013 based on the results of the Historical Radiological Assessment Supplemental Technical Memorandum (HRASTM). He noted the Navy will modify an existing Site 12 contract for additional scanning to address areas identified as impacted in and around Sites 30 and 31. Mr. Warner asked for a list that integrates the scopes and schedules of the HRASTM recommendations and the potential fiscal year 2013 radiological projects. Mr. Clark said the Navy is awaiting agency comments on the draft HRASTM before moving forward with the recommendations. Any additional areas that may need to be addressed will be covered under an existing contract depending on the availability of funds or under a new contract.

IV. Transfer Update

Mr. Sullivan said there are no changes to the transfer update since the June BCT meeting. All questions regarding the schedule of the YBI pre-closing conveyance should be directed to the City.

V. Field Activities Update

Building 233

Brian Holmgren (Shaw) reviewed the handout (see Attachment 3) for Building 233. He said slide 4 (see Attachment 3) shows a figure of all the utilities in the Building 233 area that has been the focus of the field efforts. He noted no sediment was observed inside the steel pipeline. The Navy believes radiological contamination was detected outside the 2.5 foot section of the steel pipeline because this section of the pipeline was below the 4-inch terra cotta line that had leaked in the area where the elevated readings were detected. George Bibbins (SF PUC) asked if the steel line was a wastewater pipeline. Mr. Holmgren said the steel line does not appear to have been a sewer line but was a drain line.

Bill Carson (Terraphase) asked if the terra cotta lines drain together at the east end of the Building 233 and toward the west side of Building 233. Mr. Holmgren said based on the depth and slope of the terra cotta pipe, yes. He said the path of the terra cotta line has not been followed past Avenue M to determine the end point of the line. The Navy is in the process of excavating in 6-inch lifts down to the terra cotta pipeline to do radiological scans and remediate as necessary. Mr. Carson asked how the path of the terra cotta line was located. Mr. Holmgren said they were able to follow the direction of the terra cotta line by potholing (a small hole dug using a shovel) down to the pipe, and then based on the direction of the pipe; they would pothole another location farther down the line to confirm the location of the pipe. The path of the pipe was flagged at the surface. Mr. Clark noted this is the beginning of a newly awarded contract modification to define and locate any remaining utilities in the footprint of Building 233 and the Navy will update the BCT once they have more information in the next few weeks, including characterization of those utilities. Mr. Carson asked why the utility vault was removed. Mr. Clark said there was a potential pathway for contamination to enter the vault because there was a hole in the metal plate that covers the utility vault (which only contains steam lines). Originally the vault was not an area of concern because the vault had been presumed to have been sealed.

Mr. Warner requested a more active method of communication of information and data between the BCT meetings. Tony Konzen (Navy) said the Navy will restart their weekly updates to the BCT for all sites undergoing fieldwork, including Building 233. He noted the scanning data is first reviewed by the by Shaw's Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) and Navy RASO for quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) then posted on the Shaw portal for internal DTSC and CDPH technical review. He noted the data is not always validated. Mr. Konzen noted the majority of work had been on hold and the pipeline excavation fieldwork at Building 233 has been very slow. Remedios (Medi) Sunga (DTSC) asked if an additional QA/QC review of the data is done after the data is posted but before the final status survey (FSS) report is prepared. Mr. Clark replied affirmatively. Pete Coutts (Shaw) said the FSS data packages will be reviewed by both the Shaw RSO and Navy RASO. Mr. Warner asked the Navy to provide data packages that are QA'd to the point that the agencies can review, provide comments, and communicate findings to

TRIE-2205-0003-0056

outside inquiries, such as those by the city, accurately. He said actions that occur on site are based on those findings. Mr. Warner said they would appreciate the opportunity to review the information so they can respond to outside questions about the path forward for these sites. Mr. Clark said the Navy will keep the BCT up-to-date with weekly updates regarding on-going field activities at Building 233.

Site 12

Mr. Holmgren reviewed the handout (see Attachment 3) for Site 12. Mr. Clark noted the Navy will replace the fencing for SWDA A&B that is along the berm, near the top of the levee, and is in an area not accessible to the public. Mr. Holmgren said the draft Bayside/North Point Removal Action Post-Construction Summary Report will be distributed to the BCT on September 6. Preliminary results from the Buildings 1311/1313 soil gas investigation show detections below the screening levels. Mr. Sullivan said the soil gas investigation is associated with the total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) and arsenic investigation. Mr. Holmgren noted a radiological technician had overseen all intrusive events during the Buildings 1311/1313 soil gas well installation, but said the investigation itself is not radiologically related. Soil gas samples were collected at eight proposed locations; one backyard location at Building 1313 was not collected due to excess moisture in the soil.

Mr. Bibbins asked if the presence of a fuel tank had triggered the investigation at Buildings 1311/1313. Mr. Sullivan said the Navy has been unable to locate a historical fuel tank despite their long-term investigation efforts. Ground-penetrating radar (GPR) was used in 2011 to determine if a tank was acting as a continuous source of TPH that is mobilizing the naturally occurring arsenic into groundwater. Mr. Clark said the original scope for constructing the buildings in late 1960s included a tank removal. However, it is not known whether the tank removal occurred or if the contamination associated with the tank was removed.

Sites 31 and 33

Mr. Holmgren reviewed the handout (see Attachment 3) for Sites 31 and 33. Carolyn Jones (SF PUC) asked for an explanation regarding the difference between the gamma walk-over survey (GWS) results and the static survey results. Mr. Holmgren said the GWS instrument collects a general radiological measurement by walking the instrument over an area at a specific pace. If a GWS reading is detected above the investigation level (IL), then a static survey measurement is collected by holding the static survey instrument over that area for a longer duration (60 seconds) than the GWS survey instrument. The latter survey provides a more accurate radiological measurement. Mr. Bibbins asked about the purpose of the investigation activities at Site 31. Mr. Holmgren said one elevated count rate was detected in Area-D North during a previous investigation and all fieldwork at that time was placed on hold. Investigation activities resumed and a soil sample was collected from the area with the elevated count rate in Area-D North and the Navy is awaiting the laboratory results. The field activities at Site 31 covered in the handout in Attachment 3 address the excavation of the remaining soil from Area-D North.

Mr. Holmgren said on the night of August 20, a joint in the underground drinking water line outside the Site 31 boundary ruptured. The water crossed into the Site 31 area, overflowed the Area-D South excavation area, and continued to run eastward down 11th Street. The line was able to be cut and capped on August 21. On August 21, five soil samples were collected for

chemical analysis. He noted two corrections in the handout regarding the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) analysis on slide 6, the first bullet should read: "Four samples were analyzed for PAHs." Only one of the PAH results was detected above the Site 31 benzo(a)pyrene-equivalent cleanup goal. The location of the exceedance was approximately 24 feet, not 50 feet as noted in the handout, from the Site 31 boundary fence. The upcoming work at Site 31 will include finishing characterization of the remaining soil at Area-D North and South, over-excavate areas depending on soil analysis results, and prepare for transportation of the soil for disposal.

Mr. Bibbins said he had requested from Lee Laws (Shaw) information and data regarding the smear samples collected from the material that was removed as a result of the run-off from the water line leak at Site 31, including a summary of the perimeter air monitoring results (real time air monitoring results). Mr. Coutts said he should follow up with Mr. Laws as he will be compiling the information for Mr. Bibbins. Mr. Clark noted all information will be formally reported in the after action reports and FSS.

Ms. Jones asked if there had been any lessons learned from the water line break. Mr. Holmgren replied that extra precautions should be taken in stabilizing the lines around the excavation area to prevent joints from breaking in and outside the excavation area. He noted the water lines that broke were outside and upgradient of the Site 31 boundary and were old and not as stable as other lines in the vicinity. Mr. Sullivan said the main water distribution line was replaced in 1989. Ms. Jones asked for feedback on SF PUC's response and cooperation with addressing the water line break so that they may improve any future responses. Mr. Holmgren noted that one thing would be for the field crew to stop work earlier in the day and monitor the excavation to see if any water flows into the excavation. At some point, the water did go into the excavation at Site 31, and they may have identified the water line issue earlier.

Mr. Warner said based on the water service issues raise by TI residents during the August TI Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting and the timing of the drinking water line break, he noted that how information is conveyed to the public is important especially when soil samples are collected. Mr. Sullivan stated the water service issues raised by the public during the RAB meeting are not related to the water line break. Denise Tsuji (DTSC) stated, for communication purposes, it is important to not assume what is known or unknown to a particular person or party during a public meeting. It is important to provide a clear connection and the context of the cause and effect, and response actions, and identify the agencies involved in the response, and the path forward. It is important to identify when an issue is related or unrelated to avoid confusion. She asked if the Navy informed DTSC of the water line break. Lora Battaglia (Navy) said the Navy provided a synopsis to the BCT—Ryan Miya (DTSC) and Ms. Sunga were the DTSC points of contacts on the email. Mr. Sullivan said in this case, there was no drinking water outage from the water line break near Site 31. He recognized there was confusion at the TI RAB meeting regarding the appropriate agency to direct concerns to regarding water quality. The Navy had directed questions to TIDA. As a result, the Navy will work to provide further clarification to help TI residents identify which agency to direct their questions or concerns to regarding a specific issue.

Ms. Jones asked to clarify the ongoing water quality issues that were voiced during the TI RAB meeting as she was not aware of the concern. Mr. Sullivan said he recalled one specific comment was that residents would call the SF PUC and would be asked for a meter number, but they could not register a complaint because it could not be tied to the meter number. Ms. Zech added that since the residents are not paying the utility bill directly, there is no bill with a specific meter number that the resident could provide to the SF PUC. Mr. Sullivan said it was his understanding that TIDA was going to follow up regarding the water quality issues.

Action Items:

- Navy to provide weekly updates to the BCT regarding field activities and results.
- Lee Laws (Shaw) to provide information and data to the SF PUC regarding the smear samples collected from the run-off material after the water line leak at Site 31, including a summary of the perimeter air monitoring results (real time air monitoring results).

VI. Upcoming Documents and Field Activities

Upcoming Documents

Mr. Clark reviewed the document tracking sheet (DTS) (Attachment 4) and highlighted the upcoming documents anticipated for draft or final delivery and agency reviews that are due within the next 30 days. He provided updates on:

- Building 233 FSS—as a priority document, the Navy aims to distribute the report as a draft before December 18 or Christmas depending on the utility line characterization. Mr. Carson asked about the extent of the Building 233 scope. Mr. Clark said the Navy will investigate all known or unknown utilities in the project boundary until the clean up goals are met and the activities will be reported in the FSS. Mr. Carson recommended including the Building 233 project boundary on future figures. Mr. Clark replied affirmatively.
- Site 21 Soil Gas Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) Addendum—Danielle Janda (Navy) said the Navy received comments from TIDA, DTSC, and the Water Board (no comments). David Stensby (EPA) said EPA comments will be provided shortly.
- Bayside/North Point Post-Construction Summary Report—to be distributed as a draft on September 6.
- Site 33 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR)—Mr. Clark noted the importance of providing agency comments in a timely manner as Site 33 is a closing condition of the initial transfer. Mr. Holmgren said the draft Site 33 RACR will be distributed the by the end of the week.
- HRASTM—Mr. Clark said Arc Ecology (RAB Member) requested an extension for comments to October 5th. Mr. Clark noted the Navy is also available to answer any questions during the agency review period.

- Site 27 Remedial Design—Mr. Carson asked the Navy to identify the “other” agency that provided comments. Ms. Battaglia said there were two: Anchor QEA (consultant to the marina developer) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). No comments have been directly received from the California Department of Fish and Game.
- YF3 Field Activity Report—Ms. Janda said the Navy received comments from TIDA only.

Action Items:

- Navy will include the Building 233 project boundary on future figures.

Field Schedule

Mr. Clark reviewed the field activities scheduled to begin within the next 30 days (see Attachment 5). Mr. Carson asked when the strategy, schedule, and deliverables information will be available for the additional radiological scanning activities. Mr. Clark said by October 2012. He noted Building 3 will have a separate work plan from the Building 233 work plan that includes the utilities in the Building 3 footprint.

Action Items:

- Navy to provide a strategy, schedule, and deliverable list for the additional radiological scanning activities to the BCT.

VII. RAB Meeting Agenda/Community Relations Update

Mr. Sullivan said the draft agenda for the October 16 RAB meeting will be provided by the October 3 BCT meeting. Mr. Sullivan added the Navy will be holding a community meeting on September 18 to address resident comments and concerns on the Navy’s radiological program that were voiced during the August RAB meeting

Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech) provided the community relations update (see Attachment 6), including an overview of upcoming items that will be distributed to the public. Mr. Stensby said Craig Cooper (EPA), a remedial project manager for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, received a public inquiry regarding suggestions for soil reuse. Mr. Stensby asked about the standard operating procedures for soil disposal. Mr. Sullivan said a Navy contractor will ship and dispose of the chemically contaminated waste at a California regulated landfill. For radiologically impacted waste, the Navy’s contractor would turn the low-level radiological waste (LLRW) waste over to the U.S. Army, who acts as the central agent for the Department of Defense for low level radiological waste (LLRW) disposal. The Army has a contractor who ships and disposes of the LLRW at an out-of-state landfill regulated for that waste. All the radiological waste from NAVSTA TI has been classified and disposed as LLRW. All chemical waste has been classified and disposed of as Class I or II waste. Ms. Tsuji asked if any soil from NAVSTA TI has been disposed of that does not require appropriate disposal at a permitted landfill. Mr. Coutts replied none of the soil waste Shaw has generated would qualify for non-permitted disposal. Mr. Stensby said EPA would be calling the inquirer that afternoon to find out

specifically what the caller was suggesting. Mr. Sullivan said to direct the inquirer to him if he has additional questions regarding the environmental program.

VIII. Action Item Review/Other Meetings/Future BCT Agenda Items

Action Items:

Ms. Beck reviewed the action items list (see Attachment 7) and noted the completed and outstanding items. The update on the remaining action items from the August BCT:

- *Navy will send the scope and schedule of the radiological fact sheet to the BCT for review – due to the increased public interest, the radiological fact sheet schedule will be updated after the September 18 community meeting.*
- *Navy to organize a technical meeting with the BCT to discuss preliminary comments on the HRASTM – a technical meeting is not possible within the time frame but the Navy will meet with individual agencies as needed.*
- *Navy will email the BCT when all Site 33 data is available on the Shaw portal and recommend a due date for the BCT to provide input or concurrence to proceed with backfilling – this item is complete.*

The following action items from the meeting were reviewed:

- Navy to provide weekly updates to the BCT regarding field activities and results.
- Lee Laws (Shaw) to provide information and data to the SF PUC regarding the smear samples collected from the run-off material after the water line leak at Site 31, including a summary of the perimeter air monitoring results (real time air monitoring results).
- Navy will include the Building 233 project boundary on future figures.
- Navy to provide a strategy, schedule, deliverable list for the additional radiological scanning activities to the BCT.

Future Agenda Items:

Ms. Beck asked for any additional agenda items to be included to the next BCT meeting, scheduled for October 3, 2012. No items were requested.

Future BCT Meetings:

- October 3, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California
- November 7, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California
- December 5, 2012, Tetra Tech, Oakland, California

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.